DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 387 CG 021 068

AUTHOR Dingess, Donald P.
TITLE The Relationship between School District Subsystem Characteristics and Teacher Burnout.
PUB DATE Dec 84
NOTE 120p.; M.S. Thesis, California State University, Long Beach.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Characteristics; School Demography; *School Districts; *Teacher Burnout; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teaching Conditions

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between teacher burnout and characteristics of orientation, training, performance evaluation, and staff meeting subsystems of three Orange County, California school districts. Data for the school district subsystem characteristics were obtained in questionnaires and interviews with the personnel directors from the three districts. Data from the teachers were collected using the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the abridged form of the Social Readjustment Rating Scale, and a demographic data sheet. The hypotheses that school districts whose subsystems contained characteristics which reduce or eliminate internal or external demand, increase teacher capacities for meeting demands, or provide teachers with coping substitutes would have lower levels of teacher burnout than would school districts whose subsystems did not contain such characteristics were not supported. Failure to confirm the hypotheses was attributed to a general lack of variability on the independent and dependent variables, assumptions in the study design, and selective factors. Interesting relationships were found between various teacher and district demographic variables, life events, and burnout. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298387

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICT SUBSYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS AND TEACHER BURNOUT

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Psychology

California State University, Long Beach

CG 021068

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Donald P. Dingess
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

By Donald P. Dingess

BS, California State University, Long Beach

December 1984

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICT SUBSYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS AND TEACHER BURNOUT

By

Donald P. Dingess

December 1984

This study examined the relationship between characteristics of orientation, training, performance evaluation, and staff meeting subsystems of three Orange County school districts and teacher burnout. The hypotheses that school districts whose subsystems contain characteristics which reduce or eliminate internal or external demand, increase teacher capacities for meeting demands, or provide teachers with coping substitutes would have lower levels of teacher burnout than would school districts whose subsystems do not contain such characteristics were not supported. Failure to confirm the hypotheses was attributed to a general lack of variability on the independent and dependent variables, assumptions in the study design, and selective factors. Interesting relationships were found between various teacher and district demographic variables, life events and burnout. These findings, implications of the study results and suggestions for future research are discussed.

CG 021068

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE,

HAVE APPROVED THIS THESIS

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICT SUBSYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS AND TEACHER BURNOUT

By

Donald P. Dingess

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Cherylynn W. Carrie, Ph.D. (Chair) — Psychology

Leonard W. Towner, Ph.D. — Psychology

Robert J. Newman, Ph.D. — Psychology

ACCEPTED AND APPROVED ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY

Gilbert Padilla, Ph.D.
Interim Graduate Dean
School of Social and Behavioral Sciences

California State University, Long Beach

December 1984

Acknowledgment

I gladly take this opportunity to acknowledge those who contributed to this project. The study would not have been possible were it not for the cooperation of the personnel directors, principals, and teachers. Their willing participation is greatly appreciated. I also gratefully acknowledge my thesis committee members who provided much needed direction and encouragement. I extend a special thanks to my committee chair, Dr. Cher Carrie for her continued patience. Lastly, I acknowledge my Lord, Jesus Christ, for enabling me in this accomplishment.

This thesis is dedicated to Kelly.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgment	iii
List of Tables	vi
Chapter	
1. Introduction	1
The Burnout Construct	4
Individual Factors	7
Situational and Organizational Factors	12
Prevention	21
2. Method	27
Instruments	27
Data Collection	33
3. Results	36
Analysis	36
4. Discussion	75
The Hypotheses	75
Other Interesting Outcomes	78
Suggestions for Future Research	84
References	90
Appendixes	
A. Demographic Data Sheet	96
B. Human Services Survey	98

Chapter Page

C. Abridged SRRS 101

D. Instructions to the Principal 103

E. Instructions to the Teacher 105

F. District Subsystem Checklist. 107

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Demographic Variables	38
2.	ANOVAs for Teacher Demographic Variables with Districts.	39
3.	Frequency Percentages of Class Types.	40
4.	Frequency Percentages of Class Arrangements.	41
5.	Frequency Percentages of Credentials Held.	42
6.	Frequency Percentages of Highest Degrees Held.	43
7.	Frequency Percentages for Marital Status.	44
8.	Frequency Percentages of Race	45
9.	Frequency Percentages of Tenured and Non-tenured Teachers.	46
10.	Chi Square Analyses for Teacher Demographic Variables with Districts.	48
11.	Descriptive Statistics for MBI Subscales.	49
12.	Correlations of Teacher Demographic Variables with MBI Subscales.	51
13.	ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Class Arrangement	53
14.	ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Credentials Held.	54
15.	ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Degrees Held.	55
16.	ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Marital Status.	56

Table | Page

17. ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Race. 57

18. Descriptive Statistics for Abridged SRRS Subscales 59

19. Correlations for MBI Subscales with Abridged SRRS Subscales 61

20. Multiple Regression Analyses for MBI Subscale Scores with District Subsystem Scores. 63

21. ANOVAs for Districts on MBI Subscales 65

22. ANOVAs for Schools within District 1 on MBI Subscales 66

23. ANOVAs for Schools within District 2 on MBI Subscales 67

24. ANOVAs for Schools within District 3 on MBI Subscales 68

25. Partial Correlations Between the Positive SRRS Subscale and MBI Subscales with Age Controlled. 68

26. Summary Statistics for District Responses to Survey 70

27. District Interview Data 71

28. Correlations of District Subsystem Scores with Demographic Variables for District Survey. 73

29. Multiple Regression Analyses for District Subsystems with Ethnic Percentages for Student Populations 74

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Among the many problems facing organizations today are the problems of low morale, low motivation, absenteeism, turnover, inefficiency and job dissatisfaction. Each of these problems has been associated with the stress related syndrome known as burnout (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980; Pines, Aronson & Kafry, 1981). The dictionary defines burnout in the following way: "To fail, wear out, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength or resources." This definition is indicative of the syndrome.

According to Cherniss (1980b) the phenomena of burnout has always been with us but has only recently been termed burnout. Levinson (1981) also recognized this when he equated burnout with what the military calls battle fatigue. The term, burnout, was first used in connection with humans by Herbert Freudenberger in 1974 to describe and define a condition that he observed in free clinic workers (Freudenberger, 1974). Since then it has been defined in a number of ways. Freudenberger has refined and generalized his definition.

> A burnout is someone in a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship, that failed to produce the expected reward. Stated another way: Whenever the expectation level is dramatically opposed to reality and the person persists in trying to reach that expectation, trouble is on the way. (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980, p. 13)

Christina Maslach, a pioneer in burnout research, defines burnout as ". . . the emotional exhaustion resulting from the stress of interpersonal contact" (Maslach, 1978, p. 56). Maslach describes burnout as being similar to general stress reactions but differentiates it as a kind of emotional exhaustion that is characterized by both a loss of positive feelings, sympathy and respect for recipients and cynical and dehumanizing perceptions of recipients.

A third definition of burnout, as given by Pines, Aronson and Kafry (1981) is a ". . . state of physical, mental and emotional exhaustion" (p. 17). According to Pines et al. ". . . burnout is the result of constant or repeated emotional pressure associated with an intense involvement with people over long periods of time" (p. 17). They also describe burnout as "the sense of distress, discontent and failure in the quest for ideals" (p. 17).

A fourth, more general definition, has been offered by Veninga and Spradley (1981). The define burnout as

> . . . a debilitating psychological condition brought about by unrelieved work stress, which results in: depleted energy reserves, lowered resistence to illness, increased dissatisfaction and pessimism,

> and increased absenteeism and inefficiency at work. (p. 6-7)

Lastly in an attempt to clarify the construct, Cherniss (1980b) has synthesized current knowledge into what he calls a transactional definition of burnout. Cherniss refers to burnout as a three stage process.

> The first stage involves an imbalance between resources and demand (stress). The second stage is the immediate short term emotional response to this imbalance, characterized by feelings of anxiety, tension, fatigue, and exhaustion (strain). The third stage consists of a number of changes in attitude and behavior, such as a tendency to treat clients in a detached and mechanical fashion or a cynical preoccupation with gratification of ones own needs (defensive coping). Burnout thus refers to a transactional process consisting of job stress, worker strain and psychological accommodation. Specifically, burnout can now be defined as a process in which a previously committed professional disengages from his or her work in response to stress and strain experienced in the job. (Cherniss, 1980b, p. 17-18)

While Cherniss is the first to define burnout as a process, he is not alone in recognizing its progressive nature. Maslach (1978), Pines et al. (1980), Freudenberger and Richelson (1980) and Veninga and Spradley (1981) have also described the process. Though their descriptions vary in amount of detail and emphasis, they all parallel the basic transactional process defined by Cherniss. The processes described by these burnout authors also parallel the intellectual processing of social data which Brown (1980) asserts leads to psychosocial distress.

The Burnout Construct

Though each of these definitions has a unique emphasis, their differences may be attributable to differences in semantics or dimensionality. One major difference in the definitions, however, is the degree of specificity. The definitions of Pines et al. and Maslach are restricted in that they refer only to situations that are tied to an intense involvement with people. Pines et al. restrict the use of the term burnout to cases in which an individual is working with people. They use the term "tedium" to refer to cases with the same symptomology that do not meet this restriction. Pines et al. acknowledge the relationship between burnout and tedium, however, and use the same scale to measure both burnout and tedium. I will make no such restriction in my use of the term. My use of the term, burnout, will refer to the more general and conceptual definition offered by Cherniss.

Several ideas are central to the concept of burnout. First, burnout is the result of stress. According to Cherniss (1980b), ". . . the level of stress is a function of the perceived discrepancy between resources and demand and the perceived degree of harm that would occur if the demand were not met" (p. 44-45). This imbalance can be in either direction and demand can be internal or external. Cherniss also recognizes that many of the

attitudes and behaviors that are associated with burnout may be acquired through socialization, may be characteristic of an individual's personality, or may be evidence of other psychological conditions. Burnout symptoms, therefore, should be linked to the work environment. This implies that there must be a change in condition. As is often mentioned in the literature, a person must be on fire before they can burn out. The definition offered by Pines et al. (1980) emphasizes the role of repeated pressures over time. According to Selye (1974) individuals possess a fixed amount of "adaptation energy." In the event that this energy is depleted, the deleterious effects of stress will be experienced. If, however, an individual is allowed to rest between stressful events the adaptation energy can be renewed. Lastly, burnout involves a unique coping strategy. Many coping strategies are available. Individuals can leave the organization, attempt to effect a change, or find an outlet for the stress. Burnout, however, is characterized by the adaptation of a strategy of detachment from one's work.

Since the appearance of the term in 1974, a great deal has been written about burnout in both popular and professional literature. A long list of symptoms, causes, contributing factors and correlates have emerged; however, little systematic research has been performed. Savicki

and Cooley (1982) have surmised that in the mass of literature on burnout only 25% of the publications cite data that is directly related to burnout.

Cherniss (1980b) identified the following signs and symptoms as being those that are most commonly associated with burnout.

1. High resistance to going to work every day.
2. A sense of failure.
3. Anger and resentment.
4. Guilt and blame.
5. Discouragement and indifference.
6. Negativism.
7. Isolation and withdrawal.
8. Feeling tired and exhausted all day.
9. Frequent clock-watching.
10. Great fatigue after work.
11. Loss of positive feelings towards clients.
12. Postponing client contacts; resisting client calls and office visits.
13. Stereotyping clients.
14. Inability to concentrate on or listen to what client is saying.
15. Feeling immobilized.
16. Cynicism regarding clients; a blaming attitude.
17. Increasingly "going by the book."
18. Sleep disorders.
19. Avoiding discussion of work with colleagues.
20. Self-preoccupation.
21. More approving of behavior-control measures such as tranquilizers.
22. Frequent flu and colds.
23. Frequent headaches and gastrointestinal disturbances.
24. Rigidity in thinking and resistance to change.
25. Suspicion and paranoia.
26. Excessive use of drugs.
27. Marital and family conflict.
28. High absenteeism. (p. 17)

Maslach and Jackson (1981) reduced the construct to three factors in their assessment instrument, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). The three independent factors

are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. In a recent cross validation study of the MBI, Iwanicki and Schwab (1981) upheld these factors. They noted, however, that when used in educational settings the depersonalization factor split into two factors: depersonalization as affected by the job, and depersonalization as affected by the students.

Individual Factors

A number of individual characteristics have been implicated as factors in burnout. Freudenberger (1974) in his first article on burnout, stated that individuals who burn out tend to be dedicated, committed and idealistic. This observation is also reported by Pines et al. (1980) and Cherniss (1980b). Freudenberger also suggested that individual motivation was a determining factor in whether or not a person would burn out. According to Freudenberger, those who are motivated by an excessive and unrealistic need to give or be accepted and liked are prone to overwork and burnout. In a later article, Freudenberger (1977) continued this idea by stating that persons who are overdedicated and overcommitted may be dedicated and committed to proving themselves. Freudenberger and Richelson (1980) state that overcommittment and overdedication are signs that goals are externally imposed. They are not necessarily a job requirement

but are externally imposed in the psychoanalytic sense that they originate outside of an individual's true self. This leads the individual to develop overidealistic and unrealistic expectations about what he can and should accomplish and what rewards should be forthcoming.

In partial support of Freudenberger's views, Cherniss (1980b) identified from the stress literature five personality traits that affect an individual's experience of, and response to, stress. These are: neurotic anxiety, "type A" syndrome, external locus of control, flexibility and introversion. Since Cherniss defines burnout in terms of stress he infers that individuals with these traits will be more prone to burn out.

In contrast to Cherniss (1980b), Savicki and Cooley (1982) view locus of control as a problem of extremes. Savicki and Cooley believe that a strong internal locus of control can lead one to assume too much responsibility for clients and work outcomes and can lead to overidealistic expectations. At the other extreme, Savicki and Cooley assert that external attributions may lead one to feel helpless and Seligman (1975) asserts they may lead to learned helplessness. This latter position is the one taken by Cherniss.

Cherniss (1980b) also suggests relationships between several other individual factors and burnout. The first

is career related goals and attitudes. Cherniss asserts that individual differences in role orientations and career goals relate to the degree of stress experienced and to differences in individual coping strategies. Cherniss notes an inherent conflict between professional orientations which emphasize autonomy, collegial authority and the uniqueness of clients and professionals, and bureaucratic orientations which emphasize efficiency, standardization and centralized organizational authority (Cherniss, 1980b). He cites Kramer (1974) and Corwin (1961) who found that individuals who are high in both professional and bureaucratic orientations experience more role conflict and job stress than individuals who are low in both orientations or high in only bureaucratic orientation. Cherniss also reports that individuals who assume a social activist role, i.e., individuals who attempt to change society or institutions through their jobs, experience a greater amount of stress (Cherniss, 1980a). Two orientations that reflect worker motivation and relate to stress were also noted by Cherniss: achievement orientation and security orientation. Cherniss relates the findings of Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek and Rosenthal (1964) who identified three groups of workers: expertise-achievement oriented, status-achievement oriented, and security oriented. They found that the status achievement oriented group experienced

more tension in response to high role conflict that the other groups and that the expertise-achievement oriented group tended to cope with role conflict by withdrawing. Lastly, citing the work of McGrath (1970), Mechanic (1962) and Seligman (1975), Cherniss builds the case for the attenuating effects of previous experience on stress.

Another individual factor has been suggested by Pines, et al. (1981) who report that differences in individual coping strategies are related to burnout. They examined coping strategies on active-inactive and direct-indirect dimensions. They found that active strategies were more often used, were reported to be more successful and the frequency of their use was related negatively to tedium. Conversely, they found that inactive strategies were used less often, were reported to be less successful and were positively related to tedium. Because this research was correlational in nature, neither direction nor causation can be determined. The discussion in the next section, on situational and organizational factors, suggests that coping strategies may be both a cause and a result of burnout.

Lastly, sex, age and education have been identified as personal factors that might affect burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Maslach and Jackson indicate that individuals with graduate level training report higher

levels of burnout than do individuals with lower levels of educational attainment. They also suggest that younger workers experienced higher levels of burnout than did older workers. It was also noted that males and females differ on the three burnout factors identified by Maslach and Jackson. Females scored higher on the emotional exhaustion dimension of the MBI while males scored higher on the depersonalization dimension. Pines and Kafry (1981) however, report no significant differences in the overall amount of tedium experienced by men and women. The findings of Maslach and Jackson are tentative because they represent data that was compiled from many different samples. Maslach and Jackson relate the need for these demographic variables to be studied within individual samples. They also relate a need for further research on the relationships between the subscales of the MBI.

Recognition of individual traits and characteristics as factors which make individuals susceptible to burnout has obvious implications for career planning and personnel selection. Freudenberger (1974) suggested that individuals be screened on the basis of their motivation. Kahn (1978) and Pines, et al. (1981) reject this view as undesirable. Obviously many talented and caring individuals could be excluded. Minahan (1980) asserts that focusing on individuals in intervention masks the

more important causes of burnout and can lead to blaming the victim. Maslach (1978) and Cherniss (1980b) both view situational and organizational factors as far more crucial to the development of burnout in individuals. They ascribe to the view that prevention and intervention should focus on situations and not people.

Situational and Organizational Factors

In terms of prevention and intervention situational and organizational variables may play a more significant role in burnout than individual factors. Cherniss (1980b) reports that burnout often affects many individuals in the same organization. He offers two explanations for this. The first is that new, enthusiastic employees can, through a process of socialization, adopt many of the attitudes and behaviors that are characteristic of burnout. By definition, however, burnout is the result of stress and not socialization. It should be noted that the socialization process can affect the way an individual responds to a stressful situation. Citing the findings of Allen, Chinsky and Veit (1974) Cherniss (1980b) offers a second explanation, which is that burnout can occur as a collective adaptation to a stressful environment. To the extent that burnout affects many individuals in the same organization independent of socialization and individual factors, situational factors are implicated. Maslach (1978) cites a high prevalence of burnout and the

diversity of individuals affected as evidence that situational factors are a key to understanding and dealing with burnout.

A number of situational factors which contribute to occupational stress and burnout have been identified. Role conflict and role ambiguity are among these factors. Kahn et al. (1964) identified four types of role conflict: intra-sender conflict, inter-sender conflict, inter-role conflict and person-role conflict. Intra-role conflict occurs when one member of an organization receives incompatible demands from one sender in the organization. Inter-sender conflict is the result of conflicting demands which come from two or more senders. In inter-role conflict, pressures associated with membership in one group conflict with pressures associated with membership in another group. Lastly, person-role conflict is the result of demands that oppose the needs or values of an individual. Kahn et al. (1964) view overload as the most common form of role conflict and as a kind of inter-sender conflict. They differentiate two forms of overload: qualitative overload, which is associated with demands that are too difficult, and quantitative overload which is the result of having too many things to do. Kahn et al. (1964) report that role conflict leads to intensified internal conflicts, tension, strain, lower job satisfaction, worsened interpersonal relationships

with senders and social and psychological withdrawal as a means of coping. Kahn (1978) extended these findings to burnout.

Role conflict has also been shown to be related to burnout. Armstrong (1978) and Maslach (1978) report that case load is a factor in burnout. Pines et al. (1981) report significant positive correlations between conflicting demands, conflict between work and life away from work, overload and overextension and tedium. Lastly, in a study of perceived role conflict and role ambiguity and burnout among teachers, Schwab (1981) reports that when certain teacher background variables are controlled for, role conflict explains a significant amount of variance in the depersonalization and emotional exhaustion subscales of the MBI.

Another factor identified as a cause of occupational stress and burnout is role ambiguity. Kahn, et al. (1964) differentiated between objective ambiguity and subjective or experienced ambiguity. They view role conflict as the result of a lack of necessary information. Employees are often not given adequate information about their job tasks, job goals, requirements and acceptable ways of meeting those requirements. A second type of information deficit occurs in the socio-emotional area. It is the lack of information concerning an individual's standing in the eyes of others, and about the consequences of his

actions for attaining personal goals. They report that the effects of role ambiguity are largely the same as the effects of role conflict. Schwab (1981) reported that role ambiguity accounted for significant amounts of variance on all three subscales of the MBI. The lack of information which Kahn et al. (1964) suggest is the cause of role ambiguity undoubtedly leads to uncertainty. Sharit and Salvendy (1982) in a recent review of stress literature, cited uncertainty as the number one underlying cause of occupational stress.

As indicated, overload is a common form of role conflict and source of stress and burnout. At the other end of the continuum is underload. Freudenberger (1974), in his first burnout article, acknowledged the role of boredom in burnout. Cherniss (1980b) views stress as an imbalance in demand and resources. He asserts that if resources exceed demand stress can be the result. Pines et al. (1981) report significant positive correlations between underload and tedium and significant negative correlations between variety and complexity and burnout. Sharit and Salvendy (1982) further support the relationship between underload and burnout by citing monotony as a source of stress.

A number of situational variables which might be thought of as characteristics that determine the amount of control that individuals have over their environment,

have been identified as factors relating to burnout. Cherniss and Egnatios (1978b) have reported that participation in decision making is associated with job satisfaction, less role ambiguity, greater role clarity and attainability and better communication among staff. Armstrong (1978) reported that centralized decision making is associated positively with burnout. Metz (1980) reported that freedom and responsibility to plan and create within the system and individually initiated changes are sources of renewal, while a lack of opportunity for change by choice is a source of burnout. Finally, Pines et al. (1981) report significant negative correlations between autonomy and tedium and between policy influence and tedium.

Bureaucratic dealings with clients were cited by Maslach (1978) as a symptom of burnout and a means of coping with stress. In contrast, pressures and administrative hassles were reported by Pines et al. (1981) to be positively correlated with tedium. Metz (1980) also reports that bureaucratization is a source of burnout. Similarly, Armstrong (1978) reports a positive relationship between highly formalized rule observation and burnout.

Another factor that influences burnout is the support that is available to an individual from his supervisors, peers, friends and family. Maslach (1978) identified the

social professional support group as a factor that reduces the burnout experienced by individuals in human service professions. Metz (1980) reports that enthusiastic colleagues, good communication and administrative support are sources of renewal. Pines et al. (1981) also report that social support in both work and life is negatively correlated with tedium. Lastly, Freudenberger and Richelson (1980) assert that relationships that are open, transparent, sharing and intimate work against burnout. Explanations about the relationship between support and burnout focus on the role of support in relieving tension, providing perspective and providing positive conditions to offset or balance negative stressful conditions.

The need for positive conditions to balance negative stressful conditions has been discussed by Freudenberger and Richelson (1980), Maslach (1978), Pines et al. (1981) and Cherniss (1980b). The imbalance that is commonly reported among individuals who are burnt out can be both a cause and a symptom. Work dominated lives are susceptible to overload and have less time for positive relationships and events that can alleviate pressure. Freudenberger and Richelson (1980) postulate that guilt, which is a result of burnout, can lead an individual to work harder and longer, thus compounding the problem. Sadly, when increased support from others would help to alleviate stress, individuals who are burning out often experience increased isolation.

As noted, withdrawal is a coping strategy that is associated with a number of factors that relate to burnout. Maslach (1978) describes another factor, which she refers to as pluralistic ignorance, that causes isolation and hinders individuals from getting the social support that they need. According to Maslach, many individuals develop a protective facade of calm to mask their fears and feelings. They perceive themselves as the only ones with such fears and feelings and often feel guilty about them. Warnath (1979) also reports that counselors often do not share their experiences of fear and frustration with colleagues because they fear being thought of as professional failures. Cherniss (1980b) views the "professional mystique" as a major source of burnout. According to Cherniss, society as a whole and professionals in particular expect professionals to be able to perform miracles. This expectation is a source of insatiable demand and can cause individuals to hide their feelings and fears.

Perhaps for the same reasons as social support, time off and diversion are also factors in burnout. Maslach (1978) reports that opportunity for work breaks is negatively related to burnout. For teachers, time away from the school setting is also associated with lower levels of burnout (Metz, 1980). Pines et al. (1981) report negative correlations between burnout and

opportunity to take off. Time off can affect burnout in a number of ways. It can reduce work load and allow time for rest, recreation, social relationships and other positive conditions.

In addition to the factors already mentioned, the experience of success and the meaningfulness and significance of the job are also reported to relate negatively to burnout (Gann, 1980; Pines, et al. 1981). Related to feelings of success and accomplishment and also implicated as a situational factor in burnout is feedback. Gann (1979) and Pines et al. (1981) report that feedback is negatively related to burnout. Metz (1980) asserts that a lack of positive feedback is a source of burnout.

Cherniss (1980b) makes an effort to link many of these burnout factors together. He asserts that efficacy, (i.e. competence, achievement, accomplishment and effectivness) is a strong job related goal of individuals and is therefore a strong internal demand. To support this assertion he cites the link between success and job satisfaction (Cherniss & Egnatios, 1978a). According Cherniss (1980b) the need for efficacy is accentuated when one has responsibility for others and the outcomes are critical. Cherniss uses Lewin's concept of psychological success to aid in the explanation of why people burn out. According to Cherniss (1980b):

"Psychological success occurs when there is a challenging but attainable level of aspiration, the goal is defined by the person, the goal is central to the person's self-concept and the person works independently to achieve the goal" (p. 55). To make the connection between psychological success and burnout, Cherniss cites Argyris (1957) who suggests that if psychological success is not possible, individuals will turn to intra-psychic defenses and withdrawal. Cherniss (1980b) views psychological success as a strong internal demand and as such it is a possible source of stress. Cherniss maintains that autonomy, task accomplishment and control over ones environment promote efficacy and psychological success. He also maintains that anything that inhibits efficacy and psychological success is a source of burnout. Many of the individual and situational factors enumerated in the previous sections can conceptually hinder the sense of efficacy and psychological success.

Cherniss (1980b) uses Seligman's (1975) concept of learned helplessness to explain why the coping strategies that are associated with burnout develop in place of other more adaptive strategies. According to Seligman (1975) learned helplessness occurs when events occur independently of the actions of an individual. It is the result of prolonged helplessness and is characterized by a loss of motivation, depression and passivity. Cherniss

believes learned helplessness is the cause of the coping response characteristic of burnout.

Cherniss (1980b) also cites the work of Lazarus and Launier (1978) who reported that certain situations seem to dictate certain modes of coping. Lazarus and Launier classified coping responses into four modes: search for information, direct action, inhibition of action and intra-psychic defense. According to Lazarus and Launier (1978) ambiguity and uncertainty tend to reduce direct action and increase information seeking. High conflict also tends to reduce direct action and tends to promote intra-psychic defense. Lastly, they report that situations of helplessness tend to promote intra-psychic defense.

Prevention

Burnout has attracted a great deal of interest since the term was coined by Freudenberger in 1974. This is evidenced by the rash of popular and professional publications on the subject and the rise of burnout workshops. According to Armstrong (1978), attempts to reduce burnout have centered around improving the mental health practices of individuals and teaching individuals alternative coping strategies. Evidence of the effectiveness of such attempts is weak. What evidence does exist suggests that the effects of such attempts are short lived. Such approaches ignore situational

and organizational factors in burnout. Cherniss (1980b) has suggested four approaches to preventing burnout that follow from his definition. They are: (a) reduce or eliminate external demand, (b) reduce internal demand by altering individual values, expectations, goals and perferences, (c) increase individual capabilities for meeting demands and (d) provide coping substitutes.

I believe that four systems which are already in existence in public school districts can perform the functions suggested by Cherniss (1980b) and thus reduce the level of burnout in teachers. The four systems are: new teacher orientation, staff training and development, performance evaluation and school staff meetings. I define the four organizational systems as follows:

1. Orientation is the system which introduces a new teacher to his or her new role. It initially defines the role and communicates the expectations of the district, the district philosophies, compensation and benefits, and the human and material resources that are available to the teacher to assist him or her in meeting district expectations.

2. Training and Staff Development is the system which attempts to increase teacher capacities for meeting the demands of the job.

3. Performance Evaluation is the system which measures the performance of teachers for administrative,

promotional, salary or diagnostic purposes and provides teachers with feedback concerning their performance.

4. Staff Meetings are gatherings of teachers and superiors for the purposes of planning, integrating, decision making, problem solving and dissemination of information.

Katz and Kahn (1978) refer to such internal systems as maintenance subsystems. According to Katz and Kahn maintenance subsystems perpetuate, stabilize, formalize and institutionalize organizational structure. Henceforth I will refer to orientation, training, performance evaluation and staff meetings as organizational maintenance subsystems.

The first of Cherniss' (1980b) approaches to preventing burnout is to reduce or eliminate external demand. External demands can come from students, peers, parents, individual tasks or administration. Many of these demands are inherent in the job and cannot be changed. Unfortunately, individual teachers can perceive external demands that objectively do not exist. Each of the subsystems I have identified can act to clarify external demands. It is also possible that teachers and administrators can negotiate in staff meetings and performance evaluation conferences to reduce or redistribute external demands.

Cherniss' second approach, to reduce internal demand,

can be accomplished through orientation, training and staff meetings. New teachers often approach their first assignments with unrealistic expectations for themselves, their students and the district. Orientation can forewarn new teachers and attempt to alter their expectations and goals. It can also transmit district values and philosophies. Goals, values, perferences and expectations can also be affected by training and performance evaluation subsystems.

The primary goal of training is to provide teachers with the skills and values necessary for success. Its connection to Cherniss' third burnout reducing approach, increasing teacher capacities for meeting demands, is obvious.

Cherniss' fourth approach, providing coping substitutes, can be approached either indirectly, by training teachers in alternative coping strategies, or directly, by allowing them input into policies and decisions that affect them. At the school level this direct approach can be facilitated in staff meetings.

As noted, burnout prevention strategies today emphasize good mental hygiene and stress managment. Such strategies focus on the individual and fail to address organizational sources of stress. The approach to burnout prevention suggested by Cherniss goes beyond attempts to teach individuals how to live with stress.

It suggests that stress and therefore burnout can be reduced by reducing imbalance between resources and demand. In reducing demand, Cherniss advocates reducing organizational, societal, and self imposed demand.

In fairness to those making attempts to address burnout at the level of the individual, it should be noted that changing organizations and even obtaining organizational support can be extremely difficult. As yet, it has not been demonstrated that making organizational changes can reduce burnout. As a precursor to research which would support this idea, evidence that a relationship exists between the kind of organizational characteristics suggested by Cherniss and burnout must be strengthened.

In this study the relationship between various characteristics of organizational maintenance subsystems in school districts and teacher burnout was examined. It was hypothesized that:

1. School districts whose orientation subsystems contain characteristics that reduce or eliminate internal or external demand, increase teacher capacities for meeting demands, or provide coping substitutes, will have lower levels of teacher burnout than will districts whose orientation subsystems do not contain such characteristics.

2. School districts whose training subsystems

contain characteristics that reduce or eliminate internal or external demand, increase teacher capacities for meeting demand, or provide coping substitutes, will have lower levels of teacher burnout than will districts whose training subsystems do not contain such characteristics.

3. School districts whose performance evaluation subsystems contain characteristics that reduce or eliminate internal or external demand, increase teacher capacities for meeting demands, or provide coping substitutes, will have lower levels of teacher burnout than will districts whose performance evaluation subsystems do not contain such characteristics.

4. School districts whose staff meeting subsystems contain characteristics that reduce or eliminate internal or external demand, increase teacher capacities for meeting demands, or provide coping substitutes will have lower levels of teacher burnout than will districts whose staff meeting subsystems do not contain such characteristics.

CHAPTER TWO

Method

In order to test the hypotheses, it was necessary to obtain several kinds of data: levels of teacher burnout, a measure of the characteristics of the school district subsystems, both teacher and district demographic data and a measure of teacher stress resulting from sources other than the workplace.

Instruments

The assessment of burnout is not a simple task. It involves many of the assessment difficulties that are associated with the assessment of stress in general. In stress research, stress has often been conceptualized in terms of stimuli, responses or an interaction of the two (Krohne & Laux, 1982). Although burnout has also been conceptualized in these ways, assessment of burnout has largely been restricted to measuring symptoms. In this study, which examined the relationship between organizational subsystem characteristics and burnout, it was necessary, to prevent contamination of the data, to assess burnout in terms of symptoms only. When stress is assessed in terms of symptoms, an effort should be made to link the symptoms to specific stressors, in the present case: job stressors.

In this study the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was used to assess levels of teacher burnout. The MBI assesses symptoms which are commonly associated with burnout, but does not include many of the symptoms which are also associated with other conditions. Most of the items on the MBI assess specific responses to the job and in so doing link burnout to the job without assessing job characteristics (See Appendix B).

The MBI, which is titled "Human Services Survey," assesses three independent factors: Emotional Exhausion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment. These factors are assessed on both frequency and intensity dimensions yielding six subscales: Emotional Exhausion Frequency (EEF), Emotional Exhaustion Intensity (EEI), Depersonalization Frequency (DPF), Depersonalization Intensity (DPI), Personal Accomplishment Frequency (PAC) and Personal Accomplishment Intensity (PAI). The factors were identified during the development of the scale by factor analysis of frequency dimension data from a variety of health and service occupations. A separate factor analysis for the intensity dimension data yielded very similar factor loadings and the same three-factor structure. The three factor pattern was also replicated with a separate sample. An independent cross validation study with a large sample of teachers further confirmed the three factor structure (Iwanicki & Schwab, 1981).

Although the frequency and intensity dimensions were moderately correlated for the subscales, the authors kept them separate because a large proportion of variance in one dimension was not accounted for by the other and because patterns of correlations with other variables are sometimes different for the two dimensions. As a measure of reliability, alpha coefficients were computed for each of the subscales. Coefficients ranged from .71 to .90. Test retest reliabilities for the subscales measured at two to four week intervals ranged from .53 to .82. Evidence of validity for the MBI comes in four forms: factor analytic cross validation of the factors, concurrent validity in the form of significant low to moderate correlations between co-worker ratings and MBI scores, efficacy of MBI scores in predicting theoretically expected relationships with a variety of individual and situational variables and discriminant validity in the form of low correlations with measures of job satisfaction and social desirability.

The MBI was chosen partly because it assesses responses (symptoms) and not stimuli (stressors) and partly because its items are phrased in terms of specific responses to the job. The MBI does not, however, rule out the possibility that the symptoms are the result of stress away from the workplace. While it is very difficult to ensure that self-reported burnout symptoms

are the result of job stress it is feasible to at least control for the presence of stressful life events outside of the workplace.

To this end an abridged form of Holmes and Rahe's (1967) Social Readjustment Rating Scale (SRRS) was assembled (See Appendix C). The SRRS assesses the occurrence of, and assigns empirically derived weightings to, various life events. According to Holmes and Rahe, life events, irrespective of their desirability, require individuals to make adaptations and these adaptations constitute stress. Pines, et al. (1981) however, report that negative life events correlate positively with burnout and positive life events correlate negatively with burnout. Pines, et al. (1981), Maslach (1978) and Cherniss (1980b) all suggest that burnout can spill over into life away from the workplace. The SRRS contains many life events which may be caused by burnout and it does not differentiate between desirable and undesirable events. To correct for this and to determine whether the SRRS could be appropriately used, the scale was revised by eliminating items that could be symptoms of burnout and making distinctions between desirable, undesirable and neutral life events. Revising the scale in this manner made it possible to obtain subscale scores for desirable events, undesirable events and events of undetermined desirability. It was determined prior to

data collection that this abridged SRRS would be used to control for the effects of extra-work stress only if life events were significantly related to burnout irrespective of the desirability of the events.

In order to assess the characteristics of the school district subsystems which were hypothesized to be related to levels of teacher burnout, a District Subsystem Checklist was developed (See Appendix F). Seventy-five characteristics of orientation, training, performance evaluation and staff meeting subsystems which could conceivably reduce or eliminate internal or external demand, increase teacher capacities for meeting demands, or provide coping substitutes were assembled into a checklist. The checklist and a number of district demographic items were assembled into a questionnaire and mailed to 200 California elementary and unified school districts which contained at least three schools. This three school restriction was made because the three districts that were to be involved in the study were medium to large size districts. It was felt that districts with fewer than three schools would differ organizationally from medium and larger sized districts. The 200 districts that were mailed the questionnaires constituted virtually all of the California school districts with at least three schools. The questionnaire, along with cover letters and business reply envelopes were addressed and mailed to the

district personnel directors.

The questionnaires were mailed in mid-May of 1983 and by mid-June, seventy-seven completed questionnaires had been returned. This constituted a 38.5% return rate. The return rate was undoubtedly lowered by the fact that the billing system for bulk mailing at CSULB required that a billing identification number be stamped on the business reply envelopes. Though the cover letter promised that the responses would be anonymous, this billing number was suspected by some districts to be a district identification number. One incomplete questionnaire was returned with a note to this effect. On many of the business reply envelopes which were returned with completed questionnaires, the billing identification number had been scratched out.

Item by subscale score correlations were computed for the checklist based upon the responses of the seventy-seven returned questionnaires and items that were not significantly correlated with their subscale scores were eliminated. Alpha coefficients for the orientation, training, performance evaluation and staff meeting subscales were .75, .86, .87 and .75 respectively. The revised checklist contained sixty-nine items.

The statewide survey served several purposes. It provided data for refining the subsystem checklist and a measure of the variability among California school

districts on their maintenance subsystem characteristics. It also provided a means of evaluating the relationships between the subsystem and demographic characteristics of the school districts. Lastly, the results of these analyses allowed for a comparison of the three school districts in the study with the districts throughout the state. These comparisons served to define the generalizability of the study results.

Data Collection

The first step in this study was to solicit the cooperation of the local school districts. Eighteen school districts in both Los Angeles and Orange Counties were contacted by letter and telephone. Seven of the eighteen districts expressed some interest in the study and a willingness to participate. At meetings with the personnel directors of these districts, the study and the level and nature of school district involvement were explained. Three Orange County school districts agreed to participate in the study.

Data for the school district subsystem characteristics were obtained in interviews with the personnel directors from the three districts during May of 1983. Each of the personnel directors filled out a questionnaire like the ones used in the survey of districts throughout the state. The responses to the questionnaires were verified during the interviews.

Corrections to the questionnaires were made as needed. After the data from the statewide survey of the California school districts had been analyzed and the checklist finalized, the data from the three districts was scored using the checklist. The checklist subscale scores for the three districts were taken to represent the number of burnout reducing characteristics possessed by each of their subsystems.

Data from the teachers were collected using the MBI, the abridged form of the SRRS, and a demographic data sheet. To ensure a high return rate and district convenience, all of the teachers from selected schools, rather than a random sample of teachers, were requested to supply data. Schools within the districts were selected so that the total number of teachers targeted within each district approximated the goal of 100 teachers. Packets containing MBI's, SRRS's, demographic data sheets, envelopes, instructions to the school principals and instructions to the teachers were provided to the districts who in turn delievered them to the schools. Packets were returned from all but one of the schools. Return rates for the three districts varied dramatically. District 1, which included the school whose packet was not returned, had a return rate of 53%. District 2 had a return rate of 57%. The return rate for District 3, however, was 77%.

Data collection went smoothly with one minor exception. It is suspected that two principals did not follow the instructions which were provided. None of the responses from School 5 in District 1 were placed in the legal sized envelopes by the teachers. The responses from School 12 in District 3 included several incomplete MBI's which had hostile comments which suggested mandatory participation. Both of these situations suggest that the teachers from these schools may not have received the instructions.

CHAPTER THREE

Results

The findings of this study were largely inconclusive. Insufficient variance existed between the districts on levels of burnout and subsystem characteristics to verify the hypotheses. Interesting relationships were found, however, between the demographic variables and burnout and the occurrence of various life events and burnout.

Analysis

Analyses of the data were conducted in four phases. The first phase attempted to determine whether or not controls needed to be established for possible differences in the samples of teachers from the three districts and for stress originating outside of the workplace. Phase two consisted of the tests of the hypotheses. In phase three, various investigative analyses were conducted. Levels of teacher burnout were compared between districts and between schools within districts and the relationships between burnout and the occurrence of desirable and undesirable life events were clarified. The last phase compared the subsystem scores and demograhic characteristics of the three districts involved in the study with the districts on which the District Subsystem Checklist was developed.

Prior to testing the hypotheses, it was necessary to determine whether controls needed to be established for differences in the samples of teachers from the districts. To this end, teacher responses on the demographic variables were compared between districts. For the variables which reached an interval level of measurement, analyses of variance were performed using multiple regression and effect coding. Means and standard deviations for these variables are presented for schools, districts and the total sample in Table 1. Results of the ANOVA's are presented in Table 2. As seen in Table 2, significant differences existed between the district means on five of the variables. Several of these differences were highly significant. Differences between the teacher samples from the districts existed for age, years at the district, years at the school, years at the same assignment and class size. District 1 teachers had the highest mean values on all of these variables except class size, for which District 3 had the highest mean. District 3 teachers had the lowest mean age and number of years at the district and District 2 teachers had the lowest mean value for class size, years at the same school, and years at the same assignment.

For the demographic variables, which are categorical in nature, frequency percentages for districts and schools are presented in Tables 3 through 9. To test for

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Demographic Variables

	Class Size X/S	Age X/S	Years Teaching X/S	Years in District X/S	Years at School X/S	Years at Assignment X/S	Range of Grades Taught X/S
District 1	29.5/9.1	46.7/9.3	17.6/6.1	16.8/6.3	10.9/6.7	8.5/6.5	4.4/2.6
School 1	33.8/15.4	47.5/15.5	16.3/10.9	18.2/9.4	7.8/8.1	7.0/8.5	4.8/2.6
School 2	28.4/1.5	50.6/7.7	21.0/5.1	21.9/7.2	10.4/8.8	5.4/5.2	4.6/2.6
School 3	28.2/8.9	45.7/11.1	16.7/6.4	15.3/5.8	11.9/6.5	10.1/7.6	3.6/1.9
School 4	27.4/2.1	54.9/7.6	19.3/5.1	17.0/3.9	13.4/8.1	11.1/8.9	4.1/2.5
School 5	27.4/15.2	43.2/6.9	15.6/5.7	13.4/6.6	7.0/5.2	7.6/5.7	5.7/3.6
School 6	32.0/2.2	42.4/5.4	17.3/2.9	16.2/2.9	13.7/2.4	9.0/4.6	3.6/1.4
District 2	27.9/9.9	42.4/7.1	17.8/5.6	14.5/3.8	6.3/5.5	4.9/4.6	4.8/2.4
School 7	29.9/10.6	44.9/7.9	20.9/6.2	17.4/3.5	4.2/5.4	5.0/5.5	5.1/1.8
School 8	24.2/7.0	41.3/8.2	17.2/6.1	14.1/4.6	7.2/5.7	4.8/4.5	5.0/3.3
School 9	32.6/14.2	41.0/5.1	17.8/4.6	13.4/1.7	7.8/5.8	4.9/4.1	4.2/1.7
School 10	25.8/6.7	40.8/5.7	15.2/3.2	12.5/2.3	7.3/5.0	5.3/4.3	4.8/2.5
District 3	29.6/4.9	41.6/9.6	15.9/7.8	13.5/6.8	8.2/5.7	6.1/5.8	4.2/2.9
School 11	29.9/2.2	42.3/8.5	15.8/6.1	12.6/5.6	9.0/4.1	5.3/4.6	4.1/2.5
School 12	32.2/8.7	37.5/10.0	13.6/7.7	10.7/8.1	5.7/6.1	5.4/6.0	4.6/3.8
School 13	28.0/2.3	41.5/7.9	15.6/6.8	13.8/5.2	9.5/5.2	6.3/5.3	3.7/2.5
School 14	29.0/2.2	44.1/10.7	18.3/9.2	15.9/7.2	8.4/6.2	7.0/7.1	4.4/2.8
Overall	29.1/7.8	43.3/9.0	16.9/6.7	14.7/6.1	8.4/6.1	6.5/5.9	4.4/2.7

Table 2

ANOVAs for Teacher Demographic Variables with Districts

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
Age	Regression	616.598	2	308.299	4.136*
	Residual	10136.309	136	74.532	
Years Teaching	Regression	139.059	2	69.529	1.473
	Residual	6420.956	136	47.213	
Years at District	Regression	236.200	2	118.100	3.946*
	Residual	4070.735	136	29.932	
Years at School	Regression	667.586	2	333.793	9.460***
	Residual	4798.832	136	35.286	
Years at Assignment	Regression	568.139	2	284.070	8.420***
	Residual	4588.393	136	33.738	
Range of Grades Taught	Regression	10.936	2	5.468	.872
	Residual	853.222	136	6.274	
Class Size	Regression	251.543	2	125.772	5.145**
	Residual	3324.414	136	24.444	
Grade Level	Regression	2.847	2	1.423	.349
	Residual	554.434	136	4.077	

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.

Table 3

Frequency Percentages of Class Types

	Regular (%)	Other (%)
District 1	77.6	22.4
School 1	60.0	40.0
School 2	100.0	0.0
School 3	77.8	22.2
School 4	100.0	0.0
School 5	45.5	54.5
School 6	90.0	10.0
District 2	78.4	21.6
School 7	86.7	13.3
School 8	69.2	30.8
School 9	66.7	33.3
School 10	84.6	15.4
District 3	88.0	12.0
School 11	91.7	8.3
School 12	83.3	16.7
School 13	91.7	8.3
School 14	85.7	14.3
Total	82.3	17.7

Table 4

Frequency Percentages of Class Arrangements

	Team (%)	Open (%)	Self-Contained (%)	Other (%)
District 1	12.0	2.0	74.0	12.0
School 1	16.7	0.0	50.0	33.3
School 2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
School 3	0.0	0.0	88.9	11.1
School 4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
School 5	9.1	9.1	54.5	27.3
School 6	36.4	0.0	63.6	0.0
District 2	9.8	0.0	82.4	7.8
School 7	13.3	0.0	73.3	13.3
School 8	7.7	0.0	84.6	7.7
School 9	22.2	0.0	66.7	11.1
School 10	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
District 3	22.4	0.0	75.0	2.6
School 11	25.0	0.0	75.0	0.0
School 12	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0
School 13	16.7	0.0	77.3	4.5
School 14	18.2	0.0	77.3	4.5
Total	15.8	0.6	76.8	6.8

Table 5

Frequency Percentages of Credentials Held

	Emerg. (%)	Elem. or Mult. Sub. (%)	Spec. (%)	Admin. (%)	Two Adv. (%)
District 1	2.1	68.1	12.8	4.3	12.8
School 1	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0
School 2	14.3	85.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
School 3	0.0	50.0	37.5	0.0	12.5
School 4	0.0	71.4	14.3	0.0	14.3
School 5	0.0	72.7	0.0	9.1	18.2
School 6	0.0	90.0	10.0	0.0	0.0
District 2	0.0	76.5	15.7	3.9	3.9
School 7	0.0	80.0	13.3	6.7	0.0
School 8	0.0	69.2	30.8	0.0	0.0
School 9	0.0	77.8	0.0	11.1	11.1
School 10	0.0	84.6	7.7	0.0	7.7
District 3	1.3	80.5	6.5	10.4	1.3
School 11	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0
School 12	5.3	68.4	10.5	15.8	0.0
School 13	0.0	87.5	0.0	8.3	4.2
School 14	0.0	77.3	9.1	13.6	0.0
Total	1.1	76.0	10.9	6.9	5.1

Table 6

Frequency Percentages of Highest Degrees Held

	BA,BS (%)	MA,MS (%)
District 1	63.3	36.7
School 1	25.0	75.0
School 2	62.5	37.5
School 3	66.7	33.3
School 4	42.9	57.1
School 5	63.6	36.4
School 6	81.8	18.2
District 2	72.5	27.5
School 7	66.7	33.3
School 8	69.2	30.8
School 9	77.8	22.2
School 10	84.6	15.4
District 3	67.1	32.9
School 11	83.3	16.7
School 12	66.7	33.3
School 13	66.7	33.3
School 14	59.1	40.9
Total	67.6	32.4

Table 7

Frequency Percentages for Marital Status

	Single (%)	Married (%)	Divorced (%)	Other (%)
District 1	9.8	76.5	13.7	0.0
School 1	16.7	66.7	16.7	0.0
School 2	12.5	62.5	25.0	0.0
School 3	11.1	88.9	0.0	0.0
School 4	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0
School 5	9.1	81.8	9.1	0.0
School 6	9.1	72.7	18.2	0.0
District 2	17.6	68.6	11.8	2.0
School 7	20.0	60.0	13.3	6.7
School 8	15.4	76.9	7.7	0.0
School 9	33.3	44.4	22.2	0.0
School 10	7.7	84.6	7.7	0.0
District 3	24.7	59.7	14.3	1.3
School 11	16.7	58.3	25.0	0.0
School 12	26.3	63.2	10.5	0.0
School 13	25.0	58.3	12.5	4.2
School 14	27.3	59.1	13.6	0.0
Total	18.4	67.0	13.4	1.1

Table 8

Frequency Percentages of Race

	Asian (%)	Black (%)	Cauc. (%)	Mex. Am. (%)	Other (%)
District 1	3.9	0.0	92.2	0.0	3.9
School 1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
School 2	12.5	0.0	87.5	0.0	0.0
School 3	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
School 4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
School 5	0.0	0.0	81.8	0.0	18.2
School 6	9.1	0.0	90.9	0.0	0.0
District 2	3.9	0.0	92.2	2.0	2.0
School 7	0.0	0.0	93.3	6.7	0.0
School 8	7.7	0.0	84.6	0.0	7.7
School 9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
School 10	7.7	0.0	92.3	0.0	0.0
District 3	0.0	1.3	97.3	1.3	0.0
School 11	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
School 12	0.0	5.6	94.4	0.0	0.0
School 13	0.0	0.0	95.7	4.3	0.0
School 14	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Total	2.3	0.6	94.4	1.1	1.7

Table 9

Frequency Percentages of Tenured and Non-tenured Teachers

	Tenured (%)	Non-tenured (%)
District 1	93.9	6.1
School 1	83.3	16.7
School 2	100.0	0.0
School 3	88.9	11.1
School 4	100.0	0.0
School 5	90.9	9.1
School 6	100.0	0.0
District 2	100.0	0.0
School 7	100.0	0.0
School 8	100.0	0.0
School 9	100.0	0.0
School 10	100.0	0.0
District 3	86.7	13.3
School 11	91.7	8.3
School 12	63.2	36.8
School 13	100.0	0.0
School 14	90.5	9.5
Total	92.5	7.5

differences between the samples from the districts on these categorical variables, chi square statistics for the district by demogrpahic variable contingency tables were computed. The results are presented in Table 10. A significant difference in the percentages of tenured teachers in the districts was found. One hundred percent of the teachers responding from District 2 reported being tenured and only 86.7% of the teachers responding from District 3 and 93.9% of the teachers responding from District 2 reported being tenured (see Table 10).

The relationships between the teacher demographic variables and the MBI subscale scores were also evaluated. Product-moment correlations were computed for the interval level, ratio level, and dichotomous variables. Descriptive statistics for the MBI subscales are presented in Table 11 and the correlation matrix is presented in Table 12. For the variables in Table 12 from Age to Class Size, positive correlations should be interpreted in the conventional way with low and high levels on the demographic variables being associated with low and high levels on the MBI subscales respectively. For the Personal Accomplishment Subscales (PAF and PAI) however, high scores indicate lower levels of burnout and low scores indicate higher levels of burnout. The directions of the relationships can best be explained by example. The significant positive

Table 10

Chi Square Analyses for Teacher Demographic Variables with Districts

	Raw Chi Square	DF
Class Type	2.95	2
Class Arrangement	10.54	6
Credentials Held	14.37	8
Degrees Held	1.00	2
Marital Status	6.08	6
Race	8.12	8
Tenure	7.89*	2

*$p < .05$.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for MBI Subscales

	EEF $\bar{X}$/S	EEI $\bar{X}$/S	DPF $\bar{X}$/S	DPI $\bar{X}$/S	PAF $\bar{X}$/S	PAI $\bar{X}$/S
District 1	19.21 / 9.92	25.65 / 12.83	4.17 / 3.62	8.11 / 7.80	39.04 / 7.09	41.34 / 8.23
School 1	23.40 / 8.02	28.40 / 9.86	6.00 / 3.67	8.60 / 5.37	41.75 / 6.19	41.80 / 9.68
School 2	16.13 / 8.44	21.38 / 11.71	2.88 / 2.30	5.75 / 6.16	38.63 / 7.35	42.25 / 8.48
School 3	21.67 / 8.28	27.33 / 11.07	4.56 / 2.40	7.44 / 6.00	41.33 / 2.60	44.11 / 5.21
School 4	21.43 / 15.02	26.14 / 16.93	6.17 / 4.89	11.86 / 10.43	35.14 / 9.14	35.57 / 9.20
School 5	14.91 / 6.70	23.89 / 12.57	1.60 / 1.78	7.80 / 10.28	40.70 / 6.77	40.20 / 8.01
School 6	19.89 / 11.76	26.67 / 15.49	5.63 / 4.69	7.88 / 6.71	37.40 / 8.28	42.67 / 8.85
District 2	19.63 / 10.21	25.15 / 12.82	5.00 / 5.38	6.59 / 7.24	39.13 / 6.20	42.58 / 6.79
School 7	23.13 / 11.71	29.13 / 14.61	6.20 / 7.39	8.27 / 9.40	36.27 / 7.24	39.13 / 7.98
School 8	17.08 / 11.53	22.00 / 12.76	3.62 / 4.37	4.50 / 4.54	41.25 / 5.10	45.23 / 6.09
School 9	19.00 / 6.83	27.71 / 10.67	3.29 / 2.93	5.36 / 5.43	38.43 / 6.68	41.29 / 4.68
School 10	19.08 / 8.53	22.50 / 11.85	5.58 / 4.48	7.00 / 7.86	40.77 / 5.02	45.33 / 5.11
District 3	18.41 / 8.58	25.82 / 13.58	5.07 / 4.66	9.29 / 8.90	38.68 / 7.44	40.75 / 8.14
School 11	16.00 / 8.03	22.00 / 13.42	3.08 / 3.16	6.25 / 9.52	41.42 / 6.57	44.92 / 4.93

Table 11 (Continued)

	EEF $\bar{X}$/S	EEI $\bar{X}$/S	DPF $\bar{X}$/S	DPI $\bar{X}$/S	PAF $\bar{X}$/S	PAI $\bar{X}$/S
School 12	14.83 7.88	21.05 12.06	4.67 5.41	6.71 6.64	37.33 8.67	39.22 10.55
School 13	21.25 7.84	28.79 15.05	7.00 4.38	9.50 6.30	37.22 7.86	38.67 7.71
School 14	19.55 9.29	28.77 12.34	4.36 4.51	12.73 11.47	39.82 6.09	42.00 7.08
Overall	18.98 9.40	25.59 13.10	4.81 4.69	8.22 8.20	38.91 6.97	41.43 7.80

Table 12

Correlations of Teacher Demographic Variables with MBI Subscales

	EEF	EEI	DPF	DPI	PAF	PAI
Age	-.03	-.14*	-.16*	-.04	-.10	-.17*
Years Teaching	.13*	-.01	-.01	-.02	-.12	-.20**
Years in District	.16*	.05	.02	.02	-.15*	-.17*
Years at this School	-.04	-.03	-.14*	-.10	-.02	.01
Years at this Assignment	-.02	-.02	-.13	-.03	.01	-.02
Grade Level	.04	.08	.18*	.11	-.08	-.08
Range of Grade Levels Taught	.06	.04	-.06	.00	.03	.00
Class Size	-.07	-.03	-.05	.01	-.09	-.01
Class Type	.14	.08	.16*	.02	-.19*	-.19*
Sex	.08	.03	.10	.03	-.09	-.12
Tenure	.10	.05	-.02	-.03	-.09	-.01

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

correlation between Years Teaching and EEF indicates that teachers who have been teaching for a longer period of time tended to report that they experienced emotional exhaustion more frequently than did teachers with fewer years of experience. The highly significant correlation between Years Teaching and PAI indicates that teachers with a lot of teaching experience tended to report less intense feelings of personal accomplishment than did teachers with fewer years of teaching experience. Both correlations, however, indicate that teachers who have been teaching for many years experience higher levels of burnout than do teachers who have been teaching a fewer number of years.

To evaluate the relationship between the teacher demographic variables that are categorical in nature and the MBI subscales, analyses of variance were performed using multiple regression and effect coding. The summary tables for the ANOVA's are presented in Tables 13 through 17. Significant differences in mean PAF scores were found in the ANOVA's for the Credentials Held Variable (See Table 14). The mean PAF scores for the Emergency Credential, Administrative Credential, Elementary or Multiple Subjects Credential and Specialist Credential groups were 30.5, 36.9, 38.6 and 43.0 respectively. The mean PAF score for the group of teachers that held two or more advanced credentials was 39.0. Tukey tests of

Table 13

ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Class Arrangement

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	499.714	3	166.571	1.797
	Residual	13716.786	148	92.681	
EEI	Regression	584.659	3	194.886	1.100
	Residual	26231.966	148	177.243	
DPF	Regression	37.393	3	12.464	.552
	Residual	3340.923	148	22.574	
DPI	Regression	169.714	3	56.571	.839
	Residual	9976.490	148	67.409	
PAF	Regression	175.379	3	58.460	1.148
	Residual	7533.825	148	50.904	
PAI	Regression	216.762	3	72.254	1.211
	Residual	8829.863	148	59.661	

$p > .10$ for all Fs.

Table 14

ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Credentials Held

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	73.788	4	18.447	.192
	Residual	14142.712	147	96.209	
EEI	Regression	542.216	4	135.554	.758
	Residual	26274.409	147	178.737	
DPF	Regression	88.428	4	22.107	.988
	Residual	3289.888	147	22.380	
DPI	Regression	210.271	4	52.568	.778
	Residual	9935.933	147	67.591	
PAF	Regression	540.005	4	135.001	2.768*
	Residual	7169.199	147	48.770	
PAI	Regression	548.684	4	137.171	2.373
	Residual	8497.941	147	57.809	

*$p < .05$.

Table 15

ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Degrees Held

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	6.266	1	6.266	.066
	Residual	14210.234	150	94.735	
EEI	Regression	149.185	1	149.185	.839
	Residual	26667.440	150	177.783	
DPF	Regression	1.572	1	1.572	.070
	Residual	3376.744	150	22.512	
DPI	Regression	51.623	1	51.623	.767
	Residual	10094.581	150	67.297	
PAF	Regression	86.527	1	86.527	1.703
	Residual	7622.676	150	50.818	
PAI	Regression	81.367	1	81.367	1.361
	Residual	8965.258	150	59.768	

$p > .10$ for all Fs.

Table 16

ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Marital Status

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	248.729	3	82.910	.879
	Residual	13967.771	148	94.377	
EEI	Regression	560.952	3	186.984	1.054
	Residual	26255.673	148	177.403	
DPF	Regression	90.853	3	30.284	1.363
	Residual	3287.463	148	22.213	
DPI	Regression	189.475	3	63.158	.939
	Residual	9956.728	148	67.275	
PAF	Regression	168.473	3	56.158	1.102
	Residual	7540.731	148	50.951	
PAI	Regression	374.461	3	124.820	2.130
	Residual	8672.164	148	58.596	

$p > .05$ for all Fs.

Table 17

ANOVAs for MBI Subscales with Race

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	89.444	4	22.361	.323
	Residual	14127.056	147	96.102	
EEI	Regression	415.177	4	103.794	.578
	Residual	26401.000	147	179.602	
DPF	Regression	109.874	4	27.469	1.235
	Residual	3268.441	147	22.234	
DPI	Regression	173.496	4	43.374	.639
	Residual	9972.708	147	67.842	
PAF	Regression	82.263	4	20.566	.396
	Residual	7626.941	147	51.884	
PAI	Regression	99.131	4	24.783	.407
	Residual	8947.494	147	60.867	

$p > .10$ for all Fs.

the pairwise comparisons indicated that the differences between the group means were significant for all of the comparisons except the comparison between the Administrative Credential group and the group holding two or more advanced credentials.

It was determined prior to data collection that controls would be established for teacher demographic variables for which there were significant differences between the samples of teachers from the districts and which were significantly related to the scores on one or more MBI subscales. Only the variables Age, Years at this District and Years at this School met these criteria. It was determined, therefore, that controls should be established for these variables in evaluating the hypotheses.

As already noted, it was necessary to determine whether or not life events related to burnout irrespective of their desirability. This was accomplished by correlating the subscale and total scores from the abridged SRRS with the MBI subscale scores. Descriptive statistics for the abridged SRRS are presented in Table 18. Corrleations for SRRS subscale and total scores with MBI subscale scores are presented in Table 19. Attributing the non-significant correlations in Table 19 to chance, it could not be concluded that the relationship between life events and burnout is unaffected by the

Table 18

Descriptive Statistics for Abridged SRRS Subscales

	Positive $\bar{X}$/S	Negative $\bar{X}$/S	Undetermined $\bar{X}$/S	Total $\bar{X}$/S
District 1	29.50 34.83	39.94 42.42	29.57 33.22	99.00 74.44
School 1	48.33 53.17	71.00 60.97	44.00 35.91	163.33 109.87
School 2	41.71 44.41	49.00 46.98	32.57 49.89	123.27 74.31
School 3	24.29 22.12	14.29 25.53	9.71 16.84	48.29 31.40
School 4	8.00 13.16	22.33 32.57	30.33 33.57	60.67 67.97
School 5	35.64 32.49	41.82 32.75	25.09 26.61	102.55 68.95
School 6	16.50 27.66	37.40 44.57	40.00 32.12	93.90 52.52
District 2	26.76 30.77	33.94 45.60	30.88 27.37	91.57 68.22
School 7	22.80 29.32	18.88 29.69	32.93 24.44	74.60 62.94
School 8	29.62 34.54	41.23 57.45	35.92 35.18	106.78 74.13
School 9	35.50 30.81	37.13 43.06	15.86 19.45	88.50 76.25
School 10	25.00 31.23	45.58 50.36	30.58 25.59	101.17 68.51
District 3	45.36 37.09	32.06 55.51	31.13 34.88	108.13 83.62
School 11	36.00 33.98	54.17 76.70	23.33 21.30	113.50 71.32

Table 18 (Continued)

	Positive $\bar{X}$/S	Negative $\bar{X}$/S	Undetermined $\bar{X}$/S	Total $\bar{X}$/S
School 12	55.47 39.41	31.77 52.95	35.82 34.24	123.06 82.11
School 13	42.14 32.59	28.91 61.70	31.59 40.05	102.64 97.93
School 14	45.91 41.70	22.95 32.75	31.29 37.39	98.71 78.93
Overall	35.53 35.58	34.78 49.17	30.62 32.20	100.75 76.73

Table 19

Correlations for MBI Subscales with Abridged SRRS Subscales

	SRRS			
	Positive	Negative	Undetermined	Total
EEF	-.12	.17*	.04	.06
EEI	.03	.14*	.10	.15*
DPF	.04	.19**	.13	.20**
DPI	.11	.04	.17*	.15*
PAF	-.01	.05	.01	.03
PAI	.08	.07	.06	.11

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

desirability of the life events. The pattern of correlations in fact may suggest the opposite, that desirable and undesirable life events are related differently to burnout. It was decided, therefore, that it would be inappropriate to use the SRRS total score to control for the effects of extra-work stress. The abridged SRRS subscales should, however, be used to control for the effects of life events which occur away from the workplace.

To test the hypotheses, multiple regression analyses were performed for each of the MBI subscales with the district subsystem scores. The district subsystem characteristics were assumed to have been experienced equally by all of the teachers within each district and the scores for each district's subsystems were assigned to all of their teachers. Results of the multiple regression analyses are presented in Table 20. All of the multiple correlations were very small and non-significant.

Because the multiple correlations were so small and failed to reach significance, it was decided that controlling for the effects of age, the number of years that teachers had been at their districts and schools, and the effects of extra-work stressors was premature.

In an attempt to account for the lack of relationship between the district subsystem characteristics and burnout,

Table 20

Multiple Regression Analyses for MBI Subscale Scores with District Subsystem Scores

	Multiple R	Variables in Equation	Beta	ANOVAs Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	.06	Orientation	.057	Regression	48.792	2	24.396	.259
		Training	.004	Residual	14774.018	157	94.102	
EEI	.02	Orientation	-.006	Regression	6.442	2	3.221	.018
		Training	.014	Residual	27844.658	157	177.355	
DPF	.10	Orientation	.000	Regression	36.697	2	18.349	.831
		Training	.102	Residual	3466.896	157	22.082	
DPI	.15	Orientation	-.142	Regression	234.711	2	117.356	1.773
		Training	.042	Residual	10390.382	157	66.181	
PAF	.05	Orientation	.042	Regression	15.672	2	7.836	.156
		Training	-.013	Residual	7874.378	157	50.155	
PAI	.11	Orientation	.098	Regression	104.924	2	52.462	.895
		Training	-.039	Residual	9199.851	157	58.598	

Note. Performance Evaluation and Staff Meeting variables were not included in the equations due to insufficient tolerance. $p > .10$ for all Fs

analyses of variance using multiple regression and effect coding were performed for the districts on each of the MBI subscales. The results are presented in Table 21. No significant differences between district means on MBI subscales were found.

This study focused primarily on organizational variables at the district level. To determine whether or not variables at the school level could be related to levels of teacher burnout, analyses of variance using multiple regression and dummy coding were performed for schools within each district on each of the MBI subscales. The ANOVA summary tables are presented in Tables 22 through 24. No significant differences in school means on MBI subscales were found for Districts 1 or 2. A significant difference was found for the schools in District 3 on the PAI subscale (see Table 24).

The pattern of correlations for the SRRS and MBI subscales left the relationship between burnout and the desirability of life events unclear. Age was significantly correlated with several of the MBI subscales and it was reasoned that age could also be related to the experience of stressful life events. To test this notion, correlations were computed for age and the abridged SRRS subscales. The correlations between age and the Positive, Negative and Undetermined subscales -.35, -.03 and -.07 respectively. The correlation between age and the total

Table 21

ANOVAs for Districts on MBI Subscales

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	35.347	2	17.674	.186
	Residual	14181.153	149	95.176	
EEI	Regression	14.182	2	7.091	.039
	Residual	26802.443	149	179.882	
DPF	Regression	57.597	2	28.799	1.292
	Residual	3320.719	149	22.287	
DPI	Regression	314.834	2	157.417	2.386
	Residual	9831.370	149	65.982	
PAF	Regression	15.310	2	7.665	.148
	Residual	7693.894	149	51.637	
PAI	Regression	102.339	2	51.169	.852
	Residual	8944.286	149	60.029	

$p > .05$ for all Fs.

Table 22

ANOVAs for Schools within District 1 on MBI Subscales

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	585.352	5	117.070	1.112
	Residual	3893.625	37	105.233	
EEI	Regression	255.713	5	51.143	1.112
	Residual	7048.333	37	190.496	
DPF	Regression	128.363	5	25.673	2.229
	Residual	426.056	37	11.515	
DPI	Regression	217.924	5	43.585	.796
	Residual	2024.681	37	54.721	
PAF	Regression	307.295	5	61.459	1.174
	Residual	1936.333	37	52.333	
PAI	Regression	352.637	5	70.527	1.181
	Residual	2210.014	37	59.730	

$p > .05$ for all Fs.

Table 23

ANOVAs for Schools within District 2 on MBI Subscales

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	301.285	4	75.321	.648
	Residual	4647.915	40	116.198	
EEI	Regression	437.020	4	109.255	.639
	Residual	6838.980	40	170.975	
DPF	Regression	83.735	4	20.934	.671
	Residual	1247.465	40	31.187	
DPI	Regression	89.664	4	22.416	.397
	Residual	2256.336	40	56.408	
PAF	Regression	237.098	4	59.274	1.653
	Residual	1434.102	40	35.853	
PAI	Regression	328.584	4	82.146	1.950
	Residual	1684.616	40	42.115	

$p > .05$ for all Fs.

Table 24

ANOVAS for Schools within District 3 on MBI Subscales

	Source	SS	DF	MS	F
EEF	Regression	404.531	3	134.844	1.856
	Residual	4941.344	68	72.667	
EEI	Regression	1094.921	3	364.974	2.039
	Residual	12169.690	68	176.966	
DPF	Regression	143.937	3	47.979	2.270
	Residual	1437.341	68	21.137	
DPI	Regression	449.512	3	149.837	1.904
	Residual	5352.266	68	78.710	
PAF	Regression	286.998	3	95.666	1.771
	Residual	3672.502	68	54.007	
PAI	Regression	555.344	3	185.115	3.094*
	Residual	4068.656	68	59.833	

*$p < .05$.

Table 25

Partial Correlations Between the Positive SRRS Subscale and MBI Subscales with Age Controlled

	EEF	EEI	DPF	DPI	PAF	PAI
Positve SRRS Subscale	-.16*	-.02	-.05	.07	-.01	.08

*$p < .05$.

scale was -.20. The correlations for the Positive subscale with age and the total scale with age were both significant with p values less than .01. Since age was significantly correlated with several of the MBI subscales and with the Positive SRRS subscale, partial correlations for the Positive SRRS subscale and the MBI subscales with the effects of age controlled were computed. The results are shown in Table 25 (page 68). Comparing the results in Table 25 with the results in Table 19 (page 61) it is evident that the correlation between the Positive subscale of the abridged SRRS and the EEF subscale of the MBI increased to the point of significance when the variable age was controlled for.

Lastly, the subsystem scores and demographic data for the three districts in the study were compared with those of the districts that responded to the statewide survey in which the District Subsystem Checklist was developed. Table 26 presents the summary statistics for the districts that responded to the survey. The data for the three districts in the study are presented in Table 27. Note that the subscale scores for the three districts in the study are generally far above the means for the districts that responded to the survey. Note also that the district sizes of the three districts, as indicated by the numbers of teachers and schools, are larger than those of the districts that responded to the survey.

Table 26

Summary Statistics for District Responses to Survey

	$\bar{X}$	S
Checklist Subscale Scores:		
Orientation	11.96	3.59
Training	12.46	4.63
Performance Evaluation	9.07	2.77
Staff Meeting	9.74	2.58
Demographic Variables:		
District Age	44.17	30.20
No. of Elementary Teachers	81.84	135.66
No. of Elementary Schools	9.41	5.19
Student Ethnicity		
White %	65.23	24.14
Black %	4.61	7.10
Hispanic %	25.60	23.22
Asian	5.14	6.08

	Frequency Percentages	
Secondary Schools	Yes 69.3	No 30.7
Layoffs	Yes 27.6	No 72.4
Enrollment Trend	Increasing	47.4
	Decreasing	27.6
	Stable	25.0

Table 27

District Interview Data

	District 1	District 2	District 3
Subsystem Scores:			
Orientation	17	20	15
Training	14	15	15
Performance Evaluation	10	10	12
Staff Meeting	9	13	12
Demographic Data:			
District Age	40+	88	77
No. of Elem. Teachers	355	170	412
No. of Elem. Schools	15	7	20
Student Ethnicity			
White	54%[a]	75.3%	49%
Black	1%[a]	1.6%	1%
Hispanic	20%[a]	13.4%	45%
Asian	25%[a]	9.4%	5%
Enrollment	Decreasing	Decreasing	Increasing
Secondary Schools	No[b]	No	No
Layoffs	No[c]	Yes	No

[a]Estimated percentages. [b]District has intermediate schools. [c]Twenty-seven teachers were given layoff notices in the Spring of 1983. All were rehired before September.

To determine the relationship between characteristics of the districts that responded to the survey and their subsystem scores, correlations were computed. The results are presented in Table 28. The correlation between Enrollment Trend and the Staff Meeting subscale indicates that districts that have decreasing enrollments tend to have low Staff Meeting subscale scores and districts that have increasing enrollments tend to have high Staff Meeting subscale scores. The correlations between Layoffs and the Performance Evaluation and Staff Meeting subscale scores indicate that districts that have laid off teachers within the last three years tend to have high Performance Evaluation and Staff Meeting subscale scores and districts that have not laid off teachers within the last three years tend to have low Performance Evaluation and Staff Meeting subscale scores. Table 29 contains multiple regression analyses of the subsystem scores with the student ethnic distributions of the districts. The student ethnic composition of school districts was found to have a significant positive multiple correlation with the Staff Meeting subscale scores.

Table 28

Correlations of District Subsystem Scores with Demographic Variables for District Survey

	Orientation	Training	Performance Evaluation	Staff Meeting
District Age	.12	.06	.08	-.02
No. Elementary Teachers	.14	.22*	-.01	.09
No. Elementary Schools	.15	.16	.08	.10
Enrollment Trend	.12	-.01	-.02	.22*
Secondary Schools	-.10	.00	.13	-.13
Layoffs	.11	.05	.20*	.21*

*$p < .05$.

Table 29

Multiple Regression Analyses for District Subsystems with Ethnic Percentages of Student Populations

Dependent Variables	Mult. R	Variables Entered Into Equation	Beta	ANOVAs Source	SS	DF	MS	F
Orientation	.29	Black %	.58	Regression	77.48	4	19.37	1.49
		Hispanic %	1.61	Residual	833.07	64	13.02	
		Asian %	.59					
		White %	1.70					
Training	.31	Black %	.39	Regression	144.57	4	36.14	1.65
		Hispanic %	.74	Residual	547.94	64	21.91	
		Asian %	.39					
		White %	.77					
Performance Evaluation	.17	Black %	.05	Regression	16.93	4	4.23	.49
		Hispanic %	.31	Residual	547.94	64	8.56	
		Asian %	.05					
		White %	.88					
Staff Meeting	.40	Black %	.68	Regression	78.11	4	19.53	3.10*
		Hispanic %	2.38	Residual	403.64	64	6.31	
		Asian %	.90					
		White %	2.78					

*$p < .05$.

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion

The Hypotheses

As already alluded to, the hypotheses that school districts whose maintenance subsystems contain characteristics that reduce or eliminate internal or external demands, increase teacher capacities for meeting demands, or provide coping substitutes will have lower levels of teacher burnout than districts whose subsystems do not contain such characteristics could not be confirmed. The multiple correlations between the district subsystem scores and scores on each of the MBI subscales were all small and non-significant. Failing to reject the null hypotheses does not lead to automatic acceptance of the alternative hypotheses. Several aspects of the study, in fact, suggest that the hypotheses were not adequately tested.

A general lack of variability existed among the districts on both the independent and dependent variables. The lack of variability among the districts on the MBI subscales was demonstrated in the ANOVA's presented in Table 21 (page 65). The lack of variability among district subsystem scores, however, is not readily apparent from the data in Table 27 (page 71). The

standard errors of measurement for the Orientation, Training, Performance Evaluation and Staff Meeting subscales are 1.80, 1.73, 1.59 and 1.29 respectively. Comparing pairs of district subscale scores using these SEM's reveals that only three of the twelve comparisons have p-values less than .05. The Orientation subscale score for District 3 differed significantly from that of District 2 and the Staff Meeting subscale score for District 1 differed significantly from those of Districts 2 and 3. The effect of the difference between the Orientation subscale scores on burnout may have been lessened, however, by the amount of experience of the teachers. And, though the enrollment for District 3 is increasing slightly now, hiring and therefore new teacher orientation have been very limited in each of the districts in recent years. If, as might be expected, the effects of an orientation program on preventing burnout are greater for newer teachers than for teachers with a great deal of experience, the limited hiring by the districts may mean that the effects of any differences which may exist in the Orientation subsystems of the districts have dissipated.

The apparent differences in the Staff Meeting subsystem scores should also be interpreted with caution. The subscale scores reflect district policy on how school staff meetings should be conducted. In all three

districts the manner in which staff meetings are conducted is largely left up to the principals. Policies regarding teacher attendance and the frequency of staff meetings were present at the district level, but for other characteristics the personnel directors reflected the suggestions that have been made to the principals along with their conceptions of what actually transpires at the staff meetings. The Staff Meeting subsystem scores are very likely therefore to not only reflect factors at both the district and school levels but also are likely to inaccurately reflect the characteristics of the staff meetings at the individual schools.

Another aspect of the study which may have affected the testing of the hypotheses is the fact that the district subsystem scores for each district were assigned to all of the teachers in their respective districts. The assumption that all of the teachers had similar experiences with the characteristics of the subsystems may not have been warranted. Lastly, selective factors for the districts that agreed to participate in the study and the teachers who volunteered their responses may have resulted in a very homogeneous sample.

Though the hypotheses were not confirmed, two outcomes are consistent with the hypotheses. To the extent that districts do not differ on their subsystem characteristics and these characteristics are related to

burnout, low variability on teacher burnout between districts would be expected. Consistent with this expectation, there was little variability between districts on either the MBI subscales or the district subsystem scores. Secondly, high overall scores on the district subsystem scores should be associated with low burnout scores. As already noted, the subsystem scores for the three districts in the study were far above the mean subscale scores for the seventy-seven districts that responded to the survey. As would be expected, the overall mean MBI subscale scores for the three districts in the study fell in the low to moderate ranges for the MBI subscales.

Other Interesting Outcomes

Though not the subject of investigation in this study, several interesting relationships surfaced in the analyses to determine whether controls were needed for some of the variables. The first of the relationships to be considered here are those between the teacher demographic variables and burnout. Not surprisingly, teacher age was significantly correlated with three of the MBI subscales. Of interest, however, is the fact that the relationship between age and burnout was different for several of the MBI subscales. Older teachers tended to show lower levels of burnout on the EEI and DPF subscales, but they also tended to show

higher levels of burnout on the PAI subscale than did younger teachers. Perhaps related to teacher age, many years of teaching experience and working many years in the same district were associated with higher levels of burnout as measured by the EEF, PAF and PAI subscales than were few years. These results, though not surprising, are difficult to interpret. More teaching experience might be expected to result in increased competence, an increased capacity for meeting demands and realistic expectations. Conversely more teaching experience might be related to greater disillusionment, and a heightened sense of imbalance between the energies that have been expended and the rewards which have not been forthcoming. These results can be partially explained by the progression of burnout over time. Early symptoms have been suggested by Cherniss (1980b) to be the immediate response to strain. As the individual adopts a coping strategy of withdrawal, the strain experienced initially may be lessened. The coping strategy may be said to be somewhat successful. According to this conception, high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion subscales should be the highest during the early stages of burnout and lowest during later stages. Conversely, Personal Accomplishment subscale scores should be lowest during the early stages of burnout and highest during the later stages. This

explanation makes the assumptions that younger teachers are more likely to be experiencing the early stages of burnout and that older teachers are more likely to be experiencing the latter stages of burnout.

Grade level taught was also significantly correlated with the DPF subscale. Teachers at the higher grade levels tended to report more frequent experiences of depersonalization. This may be attributable to the difficulties associated with class control, discipline, and motivation in the upper grades. Upper grade teachers are also more likely to be the targets of student hostility than are teachers in the primary grades.

Another interesting outcome was the difference in burnout levels between teachers of regular classes and teachers of other types of classes. Teachers in regular classes tended to report more frequent experiences of depersonalization and lower levels of personal accomplishment than did teachers of other types of classes. At first glance that is very surprising because special education teachers are known to experience very high levels of stress. This "other" classification, however, includes reading specialists, learning specialists, learning disabilities teachers and perhaps even media center teachers. It probably does not include special education teachers. Teachers in these categories generally have higher status and are better compensated

than regular classroom teachers. They might also work with fewer children at a time and they might not have the responsibility of supervising an entire class when they are not instructing.

Lastly, teachers with different credentials differed in their reported levels of personal accomplishment. I will offer possible explanations only for the relatively low level of personal accomplishment reported by those individuals holding administrative credentials. Theirs is a unique situation. They hold administrative credentials and yet continue to teach. This apparent overqualification constitutes an imbalance between resources and demand and is likely to be a factor in the group's low level of personal accomplishment. Teachers are required because of the credentialing process to pursue graduate level training. Compensation policies also reward teachers for additional academic training and pursuing an administrative position is one of the few paths toward advancement in teaching. If the training is not duly recognized or is not utilized, stress may be the result. It is also possible that administrative training could heighten a teacher's expectations for and therefore dissatisfaction with his superiors. It is easy to see how cynicism, the feeling that co-workers and superiors are incompetent, and isolation could result from and contribute to this dissatisfaction.

Other interesting results surfaced in the analyses related to the decision of whether or not to control for the effects of extra-work stress. The results, though certainly not conclusive, support the notion that positive and negative life events are related to burnout in different ways. The experience of positive life events is associated with lower levels of burnout and the experience of negative life events is associated with higher levels of burnout. This confirms the findings of Pines, et al. (1981). It is also consistent with the various explanations which have been offered for the relationship between social support and burnout and Selye's (1974) view that adaptation energy can be renewed by rest and recreation. This finding is neither new nor surprising. It is interesting in that it casts doubt on the appropriateness of using Holmes and Rahe's (1967) SRRS in burnout research and highlights the distinction between the conceptualization of stress as an imbalance between resources and demand and the conceptualization of stress as necessary readjustment to various events and situations in life. It also raises questions about the idea that stress is the link between the occurrence of life events and the onset of illness and that positive and negative life events that require an equal amount of readjustment are equally stressful. It is possible that the effect of stress on the body and particularly as it

relates to the onset of illness, and the effect of stress on an individual's perceptions, attitudes and behaviors at work are different. Perhaps the stress associated with readjustment necessitated by life events is both psychological and physiological in nature. The psychological component might account for the different relationships of positive and negative life events to burnout and a physiological component might be responsible for the singular relationship of life events to the onset of illness. It is also possible that the stress associated with readjustment necessitated by life events is primarily physiological in nature whereas the stress associated with burnout is primarily psychological in nature. In effect, two different kinds of stress or dimensions of stress might be being assessed.

Whatever the true relationships are, using different measures of stress and burnout interchangeably may not be warranted. Certainly the MBI which assesses specific responses to work should not be viewed as a measure of stressors and the SRRS should not be used to control for the effect on burnout of life events irrespective of the desirability of the events.

These results must be viewed as tentative for several reasons. First, the abridged version of the SRRS used in this study did not contain all significant life events and the life events in the original SRRS which may be

the result of burnout were eliminated. It is possible, therefore, that the effects on burnout of the life events which were not assessed could be more important than the effects of those life events that were assessed. Second, many selective factors were present in the study. Lastly, examination of the issues raised here was not the focus of this study and therefore the design allowed for the issues to be raised, but not resolved.

Suggestions for Future Research

As noted, this study has raised many questions. The hypotheses remain unsupported, but there is now a better indication that they would be supported if they were adequately tested. In testing these hypotheses, attempts should be made to overcome the restriction of range that appeared to be a factor in this study. Ideally, many districts with very different subsystem characteristics should be included in the study. Selecting districts with markedly different subsystem characteristics poses some sampling considerations, however. Broadening the scope of the subsystem evaluation might also prove to be worthwhile. In addition to assessing the formal policy and recommended procedures, the actual implementation of the subsystems by the principals and the perceptions of the individual teachers could be assessed. In assessing teacher perceptions of the subsystems, however, measures should be taken to prevent contamination of the data.

It may not be possible to find school districts whose subsystems differ substantially on the characteristics which might reduce burnout. Although a great deal of variability existed between the districts in the survey it is possible that this variability merely reflects differences in the willingness of the districts to be candid. From the survey of the California school districts and the interviews with the personnel directors of the three districts in the study it was clear that certain factors are present in the public schools which may limit variability. The first factor is that very little is done specifically to prevent burnout in any of the subsystems. The three districts in the study, for example, each had a very high Orientation subscale score. The high scores, however, were due to the existence of contracts and information pamphlets. While these did spell out district expectations to some degree, they were designed to serve legal and control purposes and they did little to assist the new teacher to make the transition from the idealism of the university to the classroom. Because of their formal tone they may even have inflated the new teacher's internal demands. No additional efforts were directed specifically toward burnout prevention.

A second factor is that contracts with the teacher's unions place restrictions on the frequency of formal

observations of teacher performance and performance evaluations. Though it is important that teachers not be placed in a defensive posture and that they be protected against abuse, it is also important that they receive frequent and specific feedback to promote professional growth, to make expectations explicit, to allow opportunities for dialogue and negotitation and to receive approval and acknowledgment. Districts appear to be relying on the principals to supply these elements informally. It is questionable whether principals can serve both the role of the administrator and that of a master teacher.

A third factor which exists in the schools and that may be limiting variability is the necessity for the districts to take the public position that all of their teachers are, if not equally competent, at least far above average. The lack of recognition and opportunity for advancement in the teaching profession is well known. The fact that districts cannot publicly acknowledge that some teachers are more capable than others serves to perpetuate the association with recognition and advancement opportunities. It may also serve to prevent districts from acknowledging that a new teacher or an experienced teacher may have certain areas of incompetence. In addition to the lack of advancement opportunities teachers are generally compensated based

on length of service to the district and the completion of college units. Credentialing requirements and compensation policies compel teachers to further their academic training. Just being involved in continuing education can serve to reduce burnout, but if the training is not relevent or is wasted it may, in effect, be just one more demand.

The relationships between burnout and the teacher demographic variables noted in this paper must be viewed as tentative. Though statistically significant, the magnitudes of the correlations are small. The varied relationships between individual demographic variables and burnout may have been artifactual. These relationships need to be further investigated. The relationships should also be evaluated while controlling for major variables such as age and experienced life events.

The results also emphasize the need for research which evaluates the hypotheses that burnout is related to developmental life stages and that burnout occurs in stages and that these stages are each characterized by different symptoms. If this second hypothesis could be verified, diagnosis and research could be greatly refined. Studying the relationships between the MBI subscales may prove to be helpful in evaluating these hypotheses. To clearly understand the symptoms which

might be associated with different stages, however, new measures of burnout will have to be found.

Lastly, the correlations between district subsystem scores and teacher demographic variables suggest that the constraints and pressures experienced by school districts might result in changes in their organizational characteristics which can affect levels of teacher burnout. The relationships of the various constraints and pressures on school districts to district organizational characteristics and teacher burnout merit investigation.

References

References

Allen, G. J., Chinsky, J. M., & Veit, S. W. (1974). Pressures toward institutionalization within the aide culture: A behavioral-analytic case study. Journal of Community Psychology, 2, 67-70.

Anderson, M. G. (1981). A study of the differences among perceived need deficiencies, perceived burnout and select background variables for classroom teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4218. (University Microfilms International No. 8106727)

Argyris, C. (1957). Personality and organization. New York: Harper & Row.

Armstrong, K. L. (1978). An exploratory study of the interrelationships between worker characteristics, organizational structure, management process and worker alienation from clients (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 670. (University Microfilms International No. 7812458)

Brown, B. B. (1980). Perspectives on social stress. In Hans Selye (Ed.), Vol. 1: Selye's guide to stress research (pp. 21-45). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Brumhall, M., & Ezell, S. (1981). How burned out are you? Public Welfare, 39, 73-77.

Cherniss, C. (1980a). Professional burnout in human service organizations. New York: Praeger.

Cherniss, C. (1980b). Staff burnout: Job stress in the human services. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Cherniss, C., & Egnatious, E. (1978a). Is there job satisfaction in community mental health? Community Mental Health Journal, 14, 309-318.

Cherniss, C., & Egnatios, E. (1978b). Participation in decision-making by staff in community mental health programs. American Journal of Community Psychology, 6, 171-190.

Corwin, R. (1961). The professional employee: A study of conflict in nursing roles. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 604-615.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. Journal of Social Issues, 30, 159-165.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1977). Burnout: The organizational menace. Training and Development Journal, 31, 26-27.

Freudenberger, H. J., & Richelson, G. (1980). Burnout: The high cost of achievement. Garden City: New York: Anchor Press.

Gann, M. L. (1980). The role of personality factors and job characteristics in burnout: A study of social service workers (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 3366. (University Microfilms International No. 8000351)

Holmes, T. H., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 2, 213, 218.

Iwanicki, E., & Schwab, R. (1981). A cross validation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 41, 1167-1174.

Kahn, R. (1978). Job burnout: Prevention and remedies. Public Welfare, 36, 60-63.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. B., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: John Wiley.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kramer, M. (1974). Reality shock. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.

Krohne, H., & Laux, L. (1982). Achievement, stress and anxiety. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing Co.

Lazarus, R. S., & Launier, R. (1978). Stress-related transactions between person and environment. In L. A. Pervin & M. Lewis (Eds.), Perspectives in interactional psychology (pp. 287-327). New York: Plenum Press.

Levinson, H. (1981). When executives burn out. Harvard Business Review, 59, 73-81.

Maslach, C. (1978). Job burnout: How people cope. Public Welfare, 36, 56-58.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. (1981). Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual (Research Ed.). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

McGrath, J. E. (1970). Social psychological factors in stress. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Mechanic, D. (1962). Students under stress. New York: Free Press.

Metz, P. K. (1980). An exploratory study of professional burnout and renewal among educators (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4308. (University Microfilms International No. 8002998)

Minahan, A. (1980). Burnout and organizational change. Social Work, 25, 87.

Pines, A., Aronson, E., & Kafry, D. (1981). Burnout: From tedium to personal growth. New York: Free Press.

Pines, A., Kafry, D. (1981). Tedium in the life and work of professional women as compared to men. Sex Roles, 7, 963-977.

Savicki, V., & Cooley, E. J. (1982). Implications of burnout research and theory for counselor educators. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 415-419.

Schwab, R. L. (1981). The relationship of role conflict, role ambiguity, teacher background variables and perceived burnout among teachers (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3823. (University Microfilms International No. 8106751)

Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). Helplessness. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co.

Selye, H. (1974). Stress without distress. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott.

Sharit, J., & Salvendy, G. (1982). Occupational stress: Review and appraisal. Human Factors, 24, 129-162.

Veninga, R. L., & Spradley, J. P. (1981). The work/stress connection: How to cope with job burnout. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Warnath, W. F. (1979). Counselor burnout: Existential crisis or a problem for the profession? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 57, 325-327.

Appendixes

Appendix A

Demographic Data Sheet

Demographic Data Sheet

1. Age_____
2. Sex M F
3. Years teaching_____
4. Years in this district_____
5. Years at this school_____
6. Years at present assignment_____
7. Grade level_____
8. Grade levels taught previously_____
9. Class size_____
10. Class type: (circle answer) Regular Other
11. Class arrangement: (circle answer)

    Team Open Self-contained Other
12. Tenured Yes No
13. Credentials held: (please specify) _____

    _____
14. Degrees held: (please specify) _____

    _____
15. Marital status:

    single___married___divorced___other (please

    specify)_____
16. Race:

    Asian___Black___Caucasian___Mexican American___

    Other (please specify)_____

By Don Dingess

Appendix B

Human Services Survey

Appendix C

Abridged SRRS

Please place a check next to the events that you have experienced within the last two years.[1]

1. ____Beginning or ceasing formal schooling
2. ____Detention in jail or other institution
3. Major changes in financial state:
   ____Alot better off than usual
   ____Alot worse off than usual
4. ____Foreclosure on a mortgage or loan
5. ____Change in residence
6. ____Taking on a mortgage or loan less than $10,000 (e.g. purchasing a car, TV, freezer, etc.)
7. ____Taking on a mortgage or loan greater than $10,000 (e.g. purchasing a home, business, etc.)
8. Major change in responsibilities at work:
   ____Promotion
   ____Demotion
   ____Lateral transfer
9. ____Death of a spouse
10. Major changes in the health or behavior of a family member:
    ____Major improvement
    ____Major deterioration
11. ____Major personal injury
12. ____Son or daughter leaving home (e.g. marriage, attending college, etc.)
13. Major change in living conditions:
    ____Building a new home, remodeling, etc.
    ____Deterioration of home or neighborhood
14. ____Gaining a new family member (e.g. through birth, adoption, oldster moving in, etc.)
15. ____Changing to a different line of work
16. ____Minor violations of the law (e.g. traffic tickets, jay walking, disturbing the peace, etc.)
17. ____Death of a family member
18. ____Outstanding personal achievement
19. Major business readjustment:
    ____Merger, reorganization
    ____Bankruptcy
20. ____Death of a close friend
21. ____Marriage
22. ____Pregnancy
23. ____Major changes in the number of family get togethers (e.g. alot more or alot less than usual)

[1] "The Social Readjustment Rating Scale" by T. H. Holmes and R. H. Rahe, 1967, Journal of Psychosomatic Research 2, 213. Adapted by Don Dingess.

Appendix D

Instructions to the Principal

Instructions to the Principal

You are requested to participate in an independent human services study by administering questionnaires to the teachers in your school. Realizing that this is an imposition which can disrupt your regular activities, the following procedures have been provided to ensure standardization and make your participation as simple and straightforward as possible.

1. Administer the questionnaire at a regular staff meeting.

2. Allow approximately thirty minutes for the administration of the questionnaires. Please do not tack the questionnaire administration onto the end of an already long meeting.

3. Solicit the cooperation of a teacher volunteer to perform the functions listed below, and then leave the room.

    1. Read the instructions to the teachers.

    2. Distribute and collect the materials.

    3. Seal and mail the large manilla envelope.

Your participation is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

By Don Dingess

Appendix E

Instructions to the Teacher

Instructions to the Teacher

You are requested to participate in an independent human services study, the results of which may serve to improve the working environment of teachers. Your participation is voluntary. It will require that you fill out a questionnaire and will take approximately twenty minutes. Your district has consented to allow data collection but will not have access to individual data in any form. To ensure your anonymity you are asked to follow the following procedures.

1. Fill out the Demographic Data Sheet and the Human Services Survey according to their instructions. Do not place your name or any identifying marks on the forms.

2. Place the completed forms in the envelope that is provided, and seal the envelope.

3. Return the envelopes to the teacher volunteer who will place them in the large manilla envelope, seal it, and place it in the outgoing mail.

Your participation is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

By Don Dingess

Appendix F

District Subsystem Checklist

District Subsystem Checklist

Please indicate with a check the statements that describe your district's programs.

The following section refers to your district's new teacher orientation program.

1. ____It is expected that new teachers lack certain skills.
2. ____Orientation is the same for all new teachers.
3. ____New teachers are given an orientation packet.
4. ____Orientation is conducted orally.
5. ____Orientation is presented formally to groups.
6. ____It is communicated to new teachers that they are expected to lack certain skills.
7. ____There are minimum performance requirements for new teachers.
8. ____Minimum performance requirements are communicated to new teachers.
9. ____District expectations for teachers are made explicit.
10. ____Teachers are encouraged to seek help.
11. ____Teachers are given assistance in establishing priorities.
12. ____Teachers are informed of all district policies.
13. ____Teachers are told what is not expected of them.
14. ____The district's organizational structure and hierarchy are defined for new teachers.
15. ____Non-instructional responsibilities are defined and explained.
16. ____Tenure requirements are communicated to new teachers.
17. ____Evaluation procedures and content are communicated.
18. ____Pay and promotion policies are communicated.
19. ____Grievance and conflict resolution procedures are communicated.
20. ____The stresses and strains of teaching are acknowledged.

The following section refers to your district's training and staff development program.

21. ____Training is required of all teachers.
22. ____Experienced teachers participate in new programs.
23. ____All teachers progress through an established training program.
24. ____Teachers practice and master skills in the training sessions.

25. ____Training is ongoing.
26. ____For the training of instructional, motivational, or class control skills, children are brought in to help simulate the classroom situation.
27. ____Teachers are assisted in assessing their own strengths and weaknesses.
28. ____Teachers have the opportunity to repeat training.
29. ____Training is given in response to assessed needs.
30. ____In addition to an established program, workshops and seminars are provided for topics of special interest.

Teachers are provided with training in the following areas:

31. ____Planning skills (lesson plans, task analysis, curr. planning).
32. ____Class control skills.
33. ____Motivation.
34. ____Retention.
35. ____Curriculum and material development.
36. ____Stress management.
37. ____Burnout.
38. ____Time management.
39. ____Parent-teacher relationships.
40. ____Reading and math diagnosis.
41. ____Conflict resolution or decision making.

The following section refers to your district's performance evaluation program.

42. ____Performance evaluations are for the purpose of goal setting.
43. ____Performance evaluations are for the purpose of assessing needs for training.
44. ____Performance evaluations are utilized in determining salary, tenure, or corrective actions.
45. ____Teachers participate in their evaluations. They are allowed input into the evaluation before it is final.
46. ____Teachers see completed evaluations after they are final.
47. ____Evaluations are based on at least three separate observations of a teacher's performance.
48. ____Teachers write behavioral objectives with their supervisor following an evaluation and these objectives are used in the next evaluation.
49. ____Teachers know when they will be observed for a formal evaluation.
50. ____Evaluations reflect the skills that are taught in training.

51. ____Evaluations are behaviorally anchored.
52. ____Feedback from evaluations is detailed and specific.
53. ____Evaluators are trained in the use of the forms and procedures. They receive training in the problems of evaluation.
54. ____Teachers are informed of the purpose of the evaluation prior to the evaluation.
55. ____Separate evaluations are made for administrative and staff development purposes.
56. ____Teachers serve as members of evaluation teams which evaluate the performance of other teachers.

The following section refers to your district's policies regarding staff meetings at the school level.

57. ____Staff meetings provide information about school events and teacher responsibilities.
58. ____Staff meetings are held weekly.
59. ____Teachers are given a copy of the agenda prior to the meeting.
60. ____Teachers can add items to the agenda.
61. ____School problems are worked out at the staff meetings.
62. ____Teachers are allowed input into the problem.
63. ____Time is allowed for teachers to ask questions and get individual problems solved.
64. ____Meetings have a time limit.
65. ____Unfinished business is taken up first at the next meeting.
66. ____Discussion of district policies and decisions is allowed at the staff meetings.
67. ____Teachers have input into district decisions and policy through staff meetings.
68. ____Teachers share ideas for materials and activities at meetings.
69. ____Training is provided at staff meetings.

The following demographic information is also requested.

Does your district contain secondary schools?

YES NO (Circle)

How many elementary teachers are employed by your district? _____

How many schools with elementary aged students are in your district? _____

What is the ethnic composition of the student population?

Black ____%
White ____%
Hispanic ____%
Asian ____%

What is the age of your district? _____

The district's enrollment is:

Stable Increasing Decreasing (Circle)

Has your district beren forced to lay off teachers within the last three years?

YES NO (Circle)

By Don Dingess